

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-10, and 13-14 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi (US 6,473,129) in view of Taniguchi *et al.* (US 6,445,679). Claims 15-18 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi in view of Taniguchi *et al.* in further view of Kaneko *et al.* (US 6,505,347).

The subject matter of claims 3, 11-12 and 19-21 were indicated as allowable, but were objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 3, which was indicated as allowable, along with the limitations of intervening claim 2. As amended claim 1 now corresponds to the subject matter of allowable claim 3 rewritten in independent form, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 1.

Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled; the limitations having been incorporated into amended independent claim 1.

Claims 4-7 now depend from allowable independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of dependent claims 4-7.

Applicant has amended claim 8 to incorporate the limitations of claim 11, which was indicated as allowable, along with the limitations of intervening claim 10. As amended claim 8 now corresponds to the subject matter of allowable claim 11 rewritten in independent form, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 8.

Claim 9 now depends from allowable amended claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 9.

Claim 10 and 11 have been canceled; the limitations having been incorporated into amended independent claim 8.

Claims 12-17 now depend, directly or indirectly, to either independent claim 1 or independent claim 8, which have both been amended to incorporate subject matter that was identified by the Examiner as allowable.

Claim 18 was canceled; the limitations being incorporated into allowable claim 19 along with the limitations of original base claim 1 to place claim 19 into independent form.

Claim 19 was amended to place the allowable subject matter of claim 19 into independent form. As the Examiner indicated that claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 19.

Claim 20 now depends from allowable amended claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 20.

Claim 21 was amended to place the allowable subject matter of claim 21 into independent form. As the Examiner indicated that claim 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 21.

Claim 22 depends from allowable amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 22.

In view of the foregoing remarks allowance of claims 1, 4-9, 12-17, and 19-22 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Matthew Towler

By: /Matthew D. Rabdau/
Matthew D. Rabdau
Reg. No. 43,026
Attorney for Applicant

TEKTRONIX, INC.
P.O. Box 500 (50-LAW)
Beaverton, OR 97077
(503) 627-5068
7443 US